

# Imām al-Albānī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ). the Ḥaddādiyyah, Hishām al-Beily, the Topic of Īmān and Irjā' and the 'Arafātiyyah

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ، وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ، وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَى رَسُولِ اللَّهِ، أَمَا بَعْدُ:



**S**OME DEFENCES have been presented regarding the affair of Hishām al-Beily by the followers of 'Arafāt al-Muḥammadī in Europe, as well as others who may have genuine questions about the issue.<sup>1</sup> These defences include: a) some other scholars also said that Imām al-Albānī agreed with the Murji'ah, so how can you criticise al-Beily, b) al-Beily apparently took back his speech, and c) that the speech al-Beily made against Shaykh Ḥasan bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb is from that which is made between peers (*aqrān*) and hence it can be excused and ignored.

It appears that this is a high stakes issue for the followers of 'Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, and hence, in order to justify his defence, praise and

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a follow up to a previous article, refer to:

<https://abuyiaad.com/d/rabee-similitude>.

accommodation of a Ḥaddādī deviant, these arguments have been presented. However, there is a background to the affair of Hishām al-Beily, and his statements about al-Albānī cannot be divorced and judged in isolation from that background.

First, Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā (رحمته الله), Shaykh ‘Alī al-Waṣīfī (رحمته الله), from the senior scholars of Egypt, alongside others, listed the errors of Hishām al-Beily in a statement titled: *Bayān Min al-Mashāyikh al-Salafīyyīn Fī Sha’n al-Akb Hishām al-Beily*, and what follows is a summary of what they mentioned:

1—That al-Beily said of Imām al-Albānī: “His speech is in agreement with the speech of the Murji’ah, but he is not a Murji’.” The meaning of this statement is that he fell into Irjā’, though he is not judged a Murji’, i.e. fell into *bid‘ah* but is not a *mubtadi‘*. This is the reason why the shaykhs refuted him, despite his protest that he does not accuse al-Albānī of being a Murji’. These shaykhs said that they explained this matter to al-Beily, and quoted him the speech of senior scholars like Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, that whoever accused Shaykh al-Albānī of Irjā’ does not know what is Irjā’.

2—He denied that a ruler can be deposed by agreement of the people in the circles of power (statesmen and scholars), despite being given the example of King Su‘ūd bin ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. Also, his persistence that al-Sīsī and the leaders of the army were engaged in khurūj (in sympathy with Muḥammad al-Mursī), and they advised him against this speech as well.

3—He accommodates Ḥaddādīs in his gatherings and praises them such as **Maḥmūd al-Khūlī**, who reviled Salafī shaykhs. They advised him to leave such people, but he only persisted in making even closer friendship with them while they reviled the shaykhs of Salafīyyah in Egypt. Also, he persisted in refusing to free himself from **Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Alīm Āl Māḍī** who attacks the shaykhs of Ahl al-Sunnah in Egypt, and describes them as Murji’āh Jahmiyyah. He also reviles the

two Imāms, al-Albānī and Rabī<sup>ʿ</sup> bin Hādī, accusing them of Irjā<sup>ʿ</sup>. However, al-Beily praised him and claimed he is upon goodness and that he can be benefited from and did not leave him.

4—His persistence upon his saying: “We are with our army, so long as they are with our legislation (shar<sup>ʿ</sup>)” and claiming that is correct, and that whoever denies it has not understood the matter. This is speech against the authorities, and resembles the type of inciting speech that would come from Surūrīs.

5—His attacks on those mashāyikh who advised him to adhere to the Salafī methodology and he would use degrading labels against Ahl al-Sunnah and lie against them, such as calling them the “Subkī Ḥizb” and others.

6—He was advised a great deal, but he rejected all of the advice.

**Second**, Hishām al-Beily was formerly with **Muḥammad Ḥassān** (Ikhwānī, Ḥarakī), and **Abu Ishāq al-Ḥuwaynī** (Takfirī, Thawrī)<sup>2</sup>, and then made a display of the Salafī methodology, which was accepted by the Salafī shaykhs of Egypt at face value. The shaykhs continued to advise him and realised that he had a lack of understanding. Further, as has preceded, al-Beily had a close companion called Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Alīm Mādī, a Takfirī and Da‘ishite, whom he continued to praise after being told of his reality, raising more suspicions about him. This individual said that Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb is a Murji<sup>ʿ</sup> and that Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabī<sup>ʿ</sup> hold the view of Irjā<sup>ʿ</sup>. Al-Beily would raise the issue of Irjā<sup>ʿ</sup> using the doubts brought by Ḥaddādī innovators such as ‘Imād Farrāj, who would stir up the issue regarding the terms *sharṭ ṣiḥḥah* and *sharṭ kamāl* in order to lay the accusation of Irjā<sup>ʿ</sup> against Shaykh al-Albānī (and by extension to others).

---

<sup>2</sup> Shaykh Aḥmad al-Najmī (رحمته الله) said that both Muḥammad al-Maghrāwī and Abū Ishāq al-Ḥuwaynī are Takfirīs.

Despite being corrected, advised and cautioned regarding this path of stirring these issues, he tried to exonerate himself by getting some speech from Shaykh al-Fawzān through a secret recording. This speech was then spread and subsequently used by the Takfīrīs and Ḥaddādīs to accuse Shaykh al-Albānī of being a Murji'. He also spoke ill of Shaykh Ḥasan bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā' and prohibited the invoking of mercy for him and reviled him a lot.

He was therefore declared a Ḥaddādī and was deemed a plant to divide Salafīs in Egypt through these controversies. This was the direct experience and judgement of all of the Salafī shaykhs in Egypt, at the head of them, Shaykh Ḥasan bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā and Shaykh 'Alī al-Waṣīfī.

**Thirdly**, in subsequent videos, al-Beily can be found explaining that he does not say that “al-Albānī is a Murji'” but is only saying what other scholars have said, that he “agreed with the Murji'ah”, continuing in the path that the shaykhs had advised him against previously. The door that al-Beily opened, following behind hardcore Ḥaddādīs like 'Imād Farrāj, and which he maintains to this day, is one which leads to the same accusation being made against others including Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh Ḥāfiḍh al-Ḥakamī, Shaykh Bin Bāz, Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn, Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī, Shaykh 'Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān and others, because they have also used these terms, *sharṭ ṣiḥbah* and *sharṭ kamāl*, in relation to actions and Īmān.<sup>3</sup>

There are a number of points regarding this:

---

<sup>3</sup> I documented all of these statements in 2014 in a lengthy piece defending al-Albānī, Rabī bin Hādī and others from the slander of Irjā' coming from individuals like 'Imād Farrāj, titled, *An Exposition of the Attempts of the Qutbiyyah, Takfiriyyah, Ḥaddādiyyah [and Ḥajāwirah] to Ascribe Irjā' to Shaykh Rabī', the Salafī Scholars of the Past and Present and the Du'āt of Abl al-Sunnah in Various Lands* which was published on alhajuri.com.

1—There are scholars like Shaykh Rabi‘ who said that it is an error to use these terms due to their ambiguity, and the controversy that arises from them. This is the correct view. Then there are scholars who say using the term *shart kamāl* for actions is the saying of the Murji‘ah. And then there are yet others who say using the word *shart* itself, even for *ṣiḥḥab* is the saying of the Murji‘ah as well. However, this is subject to debate and the details are too lengthy to discuss here.<sup>4</sup>

2—It does not follow that the mere usage of the words *shart kamāl* or *shart ṣiḥḥab* entails “agreement” with the saying of the Murji‘ah, and those scholars who say so are mistaken.

**The most correct thing to say is the position of Shaykh Rabi‘ bin Hādī, that these terms should be avoided because they fuel confusion and controversy, hence, it is a mistake to use them in this subject.**

3—We must distinguish between:

a) those who say that actions are from *īmān*, that *īmān* increases and decrease, and that *kufr* is also in belief, speech and deed, but that due to evidences in the Prophetic Sunnah, the one who dies without any good deeds will be saved, and upon the view that leaving the prayer out of laziness and neglect is not *kufr*, the commanded actions are a condition for the perfection of *īmān*, whether obligatory or recommended, intending by that, that a person does not leave Islām by leaving the obligations, (i.e. falling into major sin), thereby opposing the Khāwārij and the Mu‘tazilah, and they affirm that *īmān* cannot exist without abandoning actions which are *kufr* and *shirk*, and

b) those who say that actions are not from *īmān*, that *īmān* does not increase or decrease, is complete and perfect without performance of the obligations, that *kufr* is only *takdhīb*, and therefore, they may say actions are a condition for the perfection of *īmān*, upon those

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to the document mentioned in a previous footnotes, p. 66 onwards.

Murji' foundations. However, the Murji'ah hold that *īmān* is already complete and perfect by way of the belief in the heart alone, and hence, it is not known from the Murji'ites that they had a need to say "actions are a condition for the perfection of *īmān*".

4—It is said that Ibn Ḥajar was the first to mention these terms in order to contrast the difference between what the Mu'tazilah say and what Ahl al-Sunnah say. In any case, Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī went to great lengths in order to exonerate the many scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah, past and present, from being accused of being Murji'ah or falling into *Irjā'*, and spoke against the usage of these ambiguous terms.

5—Therefore, Hishām al-Beily cannot be exonerated for his conduct. He persists in his accusation that Shaykh al-Albānī "agreed with the Ash'arīte Murji'ah", meaning, fell into the *Irjā'* of the Ash'arīte Murji'ah, which is plainly false. This is close to what his close companion, Maḥmūd 'Abd al-'Alīm said, that the shaykhs in Egypt are Murji'ah Jahmiyyah. The saying of the Ash'arīs regarding *Īmān*, that it is *taṣḍīq* (assent) of the heart, is close to that of the Jahmiyyah who say that is *ma'rifaḥ* (acquaintance) of the heart.

The reality is that a man is taken not just on his speech, but also on his actions, his moves, his companionship and the direct experience of the scholars of his land. Further, his words and actions in this issue are taken upon his past nurturing and orientation.

6—As for the argument that there are other scholars who have said the same thing, that those who say that the one who abandons action and dies with no good deeds is saved or that actions are a condition for the perfection of *Īmān*, that he has allegedly agreed with the Murji'ah, then this does not exonerate al-Beily.

Firstly, because, upon *taḥqīq* (verification) in the matter, they are mistaken. Secondly, because as we said, agreement in a position or view, does not mean agreement in orientation and methodology. Those scholars who might say that are not the same as Hishām al-

Beily, whose history, background, circumstances, behaviour and companionship indicate a different orientation. Third, you would have to accuse Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh Ḥāfiḍh al-Ḥakamī, Shaykh Bin Bāz, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī, Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān and others of also “agreeing with the Murji’ah”, and this in reality, is the real purpose of the Ḥaddādīs behind this issue being stirred, and al-Beily is an individual caught up in this misguidance. This is why he was advised against it, and why when he was refuted, he was refuted the way he was, because he is an ignoramus caught up in something he does not know the reality of. Like a man in the ocean tossed and turned by the waves, not knowing which shore he will be delivered to.

**Fourth**, the author of the book refuting Hishām al-Beily on the matter of al-Albānī and Irjā’ (in 2013) collected eight audios of 40 minutes length each and from them listed the following points (in 2020):<sup>5</sup>

1—His frequent and abundant attacks upon Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), which the audios are replete with.

2—The impermissibility of invoking mercy for Shaykh Ḥasan and this is one of the main foundations of the Ḥaddādīs.

3—Accusing Shaykh Ḥasan with the innovation of Irjā’.

4—Denying the scholarship of Shaykh Ḥasan, and belittling his status, considering him like a common person.

5—Accusing Shaykh Ḥasan of agreeing with the methodology of the Mu‘tazilah, and this was a concealed attempt to defend the Ikhwānī, Muḥammad al-Mursī, by presenting ‘Abd al-Fattāh al-Sīsī and his military as having fallen into khurūj.

6—Stating that Shaykh Ḥasan is *munḥarif* (deviant).

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to: <https://youtu.be/TFVxa8kUpcU> and <https://youtu.be/cWv6pglnywc>.

7—Stating that if Shaykh Rabīʿ did not change his position (regarding Shaykh Ḥasan) after knowing all of this, he would warn from Shaykh Rabīʿ, if he persisted in praising him.

8—And much more.

**Five**, given what has preceded, when a man has emerged having had associations with the Takfīrīs and Quṭbīs in Egypt, makes a display of Salafiyyah, then starts raising the talking points of the extreme Ḥaddādīs like ʿImād al-Farrāj, maintains close relationships with Takfīrī Daʿīshites and praises them after advice, openly reviles the most senior Salafī shaykhs in his land and prohibits the invoking of mercy upon them, and continues to say that al-Albānī agreed with the Murjiʿah, rather, agreed with the Ashʿarī Murjiʿah, then such a man cannot be excused, unless one is extremely naïve, gullible and has not understood the Salafī methodology.

These affairs are the classical hallmarks of the Ḥaddādīs.

This is the type of man that you would call a “plant”, because of the nature of the issues concerned and because of very strong indicators from his background.<sup>6</sup>

**Fifth**, as for the argument that Hishām al-Beily took his speech about al-Albānī back, that does not appear to be the case, because he continues to say that Shaykh al-Albānī (رحمته الله) agreed with the Ashʿarīte Murjiʿah.

**Sixth**, as for their claim that the speech of al-Beily against Shaykh Ḥasan is from the angle of speech of peers (*aqrān*) against other which can be dismissed, this is a retarded argument. First, there is an age difference between the two, as Shaykh Ḥasan is much senior. Second, how can any person in their right mind, consider the attacks and accusation of al-Beily to be speech of peers against each other, when he accuses the Shaykh of innovation, deviation, denies his scholarship

---

<sup>6</sup> As opposed to someone who advises people with caution regarding the harmful vaccines of Ahl al-Kitāb.

and spends much of his time attacking the Shaykh, upon the way of the Ḥaddādiyyah. So now, every Ḥaddādī who imputes innovation and misguidance to known Salafī scholars and shaykhs can be excused because its “the speech of peers against each other”. This argument only indicates the following of desires.

Shaykh Rabi‘ bin Hādī (رحمة الله) was asked: “What is the definition of *aqrān* (peers, contemporaries) in the science of ḥadīth? And if the principle of ‘the speech of peers (against each other) is disregarded and not transmitted’ is applied, do we consider that application to be a revilement upon the two shaykhs (in question).” The Shaykh replied; “This principle is not applied except in the narrowest of circumstances, and when we see two disputants, each of them having whims (hawā), we do not accept their speech against each other. As for when the likes of Imām Aḥmad or Ibn Ma‘īn come and they speak against the likes of al-Karābīsī, or al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, from their contemporaries, we do not say this speech, ‘They are contemporaries’. We accept the speech of those Imāms, may Allāh bless you, in the criticism and disparagement of those whom we have mentioned. The books of al-Jarḥ wal-Ta‘dīl are full of contemporaries, and if we adopted this principle, we would not accept anything. So the people of falsehood cause confusion through it, the people of falsehood cause confusion to invalidate the criticism of Ahl al-Sunnah against Ahl al-Bida‘.

So when there is a misguided innovator and he speaks to you about his innovation, do we say, ‘These are contemporaries?’ Meaning, when Ibn Bāz speaks about ‘Alawī al-Mālikī or Ibn ‘Uthaymīn speaks about al-Mālikī and his likes, we say, by Allāh, ‘They are contemporaries!’

This is ridiculous speech, may Allāh bless you. When we speak about al-Khomeinī, we say, ‘They are contemporaries!’ When we speak about Sayyid Quṭb, we say, ‘They are contemporaries!’ And he reviles the Companions, and the Prophets and so on. This is futile speech.

The criticism by the scholars in this era is mostly based on books, may Allāh bless you, so-and-so said in such a book on such a page, meaning speech that is well-supported, proven and documented. How can one say (about this) that is the speech of contemporaries that is being narrated?! When someone reviles Abū Bakr and ‘Umar for example, or eviles ‘Uthmān, and I quote his words and present them to people, in order to warn from his book and from him personally as well, they say, ‘This is the speech of contemporaries!’

All of this is from the deceptions of the people of innovation and misguidance, and from tamyī‘ (also) at the same time, its from the vilest forms of tamyī‘.”<sup>7</sup> End of the quote.

**In conclusion**, it is clear that the issue of Hishām al-Beily is a high-stake issue for the followers of ‘Arafāt al-Muhammadi, because ‘Arafāt makes tabdī‘ and taḍlīl of Salafis without credible evidence, rather, with lies and fabrications, and he accommodates, praises and defends those who are like him in this conduct such as Hishām al-Beily. Hence, they have tried to bring arguments which are contradictory and falsify each other, in order to exonerate ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadi who has violated foundations of the Sunnah, by praising innovators who display open enmity and hatred for Ahl al-Sunnah and revile them.

Once again, I leave the reader with the advice of Shaykh ‘Alī al-Ḥudhayfī

Abu ‘Iyaad

8 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1447 / 4 June 2026

---

<sup>7</sup> From the cassette, *Manhaj al-Tamyī‘ wa Qawā‘idihī*.

## Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī is the Cause of These Tribulations

By Shaykh ‘Ali al-Hudhayfi

“As long as Arafāt Al-Muḥammadī continues to treat the callers in this way, the problems, the discord, and the disagreements will persist.

‘Arafāt is a very evil man, and I hope you will listen to the wise witnesses, those who desire goodness for the Salafi da‘wah and are far more virtuous than ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, and there is no enmity between them and ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī.

If a man becomes notorious for evil things, and news about him to that effect circulates widely from all sides, then it is not permissible to ignore these reports, as if one had not heard anything and was unaware of anything.

I have highlighted certain matters concerning Dr ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, including things I personally observed during my acquaintance with him, such as his positions regarding some political parties, and numerous accounts about him shared by many esteemed brothers from various countries, including Arab countries and beyond, which no fair person could deny.

**All these reports indicate that he is a very dangerous man for the Salafi da‘wah.**

Reports of his corruption have received wide circulation (*tawātur*), in ways that make it impossible for the people involved to collude to lie, and these reports have come from Madinah, Yemen, Bahrain, Egypt, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, and other countries. In some of these countries, the reports are abundant and have been received from more than one location. So, how then, if these reports are combined with other reports? And if these reports are abundant from just one person due to the multitude of routes (of reporting), what if

they are abundant from many trustworthy and virtuous individuals, and from various countries?

Therefore, even if some of them were not independently true, these reports (due to their abundance) could not (all) be ignored. So what, then, if they are independently true? It is not permissible—by Allah, it is not permissible to disregard this plentiful transmission.

Dr ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadi has divided the Salafis in many parts of the world through his deception, oppression, and conspiracies. He conceals the truth, he endorses certain innovators and deviants, covers for other deviants, and harasses students of knowledge who oppose his conspiracies, targeting them by unleashing his gang of fools against them, and so on.

This man's conspiracies have reached the point where he conceals information about knowledge and fatwās (of scholars), supports certain political parties in their endeavours, the shedding of innocent blood and the overthrow of the ruler. His conspiracies even went so far as to support those calling for the partition of Yemen. What vileness could there be after this?

**By Allāh, this man should receive a fair trial and be punished in a way that deters him and other traitors like him.**

He deceived some young people and threw them into the arms of certain political parties in Yemen, so these poor young people became (sacrificial) victims of this man.

Scholars have criticised the Ḥaddādiyyah because they make tabdīʿ of errant Salafis on account of errors that do not warrant tabdīʿ. As for ‘Arafāt al-Muhammadi and those with him, they fought the honourable people and expelled them from Salafiyyah because they were honourable and protective of the da‘wah. They refused to involve Salafiyyah in the conflicts of political parties.

Many people have attacked the integrity of ‘Arafāt al-Muhammadi. Those who have done so include scholars and students of knowledge, and they are numerous. They knew him very well.

**They accused him of serious things so it is not permissible, by Allāh, to remain silent about these widely-reported deviations. In remaining silent about them, there is great harm to the Salafi da‘wah.**

By Allāh, we will be held accountable before Allāh for the da‘wah, for the splitting of the youth, and for allowing the innovators to rejoice (with malice) about the (harms to the) da‘wah.”

—From his article of 17 Sha‘bān 1447 (5 February 2026)

<https://t.me/AliAlHuthaif55/3145>